REMARKS

Reconsideration of the above-identified application in view of the remarks following and the enclosed Affidavit is respectfully requested.

Claims 18-36 are in this case. Claims 18-36 have been rejected. Claims 18, 31, 35, and 36 have been amended.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections – Van Ryzin and Phan

The Examiner has rejected claims 18-19, 22, 25-27 and 30-36 under § U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Van Ryzin (US Patent No. 6,131,130) and Phan (US Patent No. 6,064,437). The rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed.

Van Ryzin teaches a system which is intended to *converge* the personal computer with wireless home consumer electronics audio/video devices, as indicated by the title, "System for Convergence of a Personal Computer with Wireless Audio/Video Devices...". The system is clearly designed to permit the user to operate the A/V (audio/video) devices like TV and DVD from anywhere in the home, as stated in col. 2, lines 4-7: "It is yet another object of the present invention to provide a converged system having a common interface through which the homeowner operates the A/V devices from anywhere in the home".

It is very clear that the converged device of Van Ryzin does not divide a personal computer into two portions which are then separated and which communicate with each other remotely, but rather is attempting to provide a

system in which audio/video devices are communicating with a computer. This point is made very clearly with regard to Figures 7 and 8.

Furthermore, the personal computer is clearly shown as being connected to a video monitor that is acting as a television, in that it is described as being capable of displaying television programs (col 3, lines 32-36). This is very important because a television set is not a computer monitor. A television would actually require further adaptation in order to be able to act as the monitor for the personal computer, because computer monitors and televisions have different requirements in terms of the signal received and the processing of that signal.

This would also render the combination of Phan and Van Ryzin inoperable, since as previously discussed, Phan provides data for display only to a television set. Phan clearly teaches sending compressed video signals to a television set in the format of television signals; such signals would not be displayable by a computer monitor without additional conversion, which is neither taught nor suggested by Van Ryzin or Phan.

In the Interview with the Examiner of April 23, the Examiner agreed that a computer monitor is different from a television set, and therefore the present invention is different from the disclosures of Van Ryzin or Phan, alone or in combination; however, the Examiner wanted to provide an additional limitation such that the main computer features a local video card for <u>digitally</u> compressing a display signal (the word "digital" has been added). The Examiner indicated

that the addition of this word would further clarify the differences between the present invention and the disclosures of Van Ryzin and Phan.

Support for this limitation can be found throughout the specification, particularly in Figure 1 but also in the claims as filed and on page 11, lines 3-5.

For example, Figure 1 shows that the Charger/Base - 16 includes a Video compressor - **46**. The output of this compressor goes to the ISM band SP^2 radio transmitter – **48**. Compression must be digital, for several reasons. First, there is no true Analog Video Compression. Second, in order to compress the video signal to the level that the ISM Band radio transmitter can transfer, true, significant digital compression is required. The wavelength of the band indicates clearly that the video compression must be digital to allow the transfer using this kind of band). At the time of filing the patent application, the ISM Band offered 2-11Mbit/second, which is quite a low rate; without compression of a digital video signal, transmission with such a transmitter would not have been possible.

The receiver is also an ISM band receiver, which would also need to receive a digital compressed signal. The signal would then be decompressed by a video expander 22, which would also limit the nature of the data produced, since video expanders are known to operate with digital video signals. Also, given the type of compression, the decompressed signal would result in a digital video signal.

With regard to the specification, it clearly states (for example on page 11, lines 3-5): Main computer **14** preferably includes a video display card **44**

which is connected to an A/V compressor **46** for compressing the video data, both of which are preferably located within a main computer box **13**.

The use of the phrase "video data" clearly indicates that the video card is producing a digital signal, as data is digital. Furthermore, the specification clearly indicates that the term "video data" refers to a digital signal.

In addition, claim 31 has been amended to indicate that the local video display signal is a "personal computer" display signal. Support for this amendment can be found in the drawing, which clearly includes the word "PC" with regard to the main computer portion, which generates the video signal. This amendment further differentiates the present invention from the above-cited references, because none of the references teaches or suggests the use of a personal computer display signal with a divided computer, as for the present invention.

Thus, the present claims are clearly novel and non-obvious over the above-cited references, alone or in combination.

35 U.S.C. § 103 Rejections – Van Ryzin, Yen, Phan and Hare

The Examiner has rejected claims 20, 21 and 23-24 under § U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over Van Ryzin in view of Yen. The Examiner has also rejected claims 28-29 over Van Ryzin and Phan in view of Hare (US Patent No. 6,084,638). The rejections of the Examiner are respectfully traversed.

The object of Van Ryzin is described above.

The object of Yen is the teaching of particular frequencies for transmission of signals to a television (reference number 1 is described in col 1, lines 59-66 as being a "TV").

The object of Phan is as described above.

The object of Hare is the use of a microphone and joystick port with a remote television set.

Therefore, for the reasons given above, any combination of Van Ryzin, Yen, Hare and Phan would fail to teach or suggest the present invention, because such a combination would only be operable for transmission of television signals to a television set, and/or would otherwise only be operable with a television set, while the present invention is concerned with transmission of computer signals to a computer monitor.

Indeed, Applicant notes that the system of Hare has been described as being "strikingly similar" to that of the present invention; yet this system again requires the transmission of data to a television set, contrary to the teachings of the present invention, which uses a computer monitor.

Applicant further notes that as independent claims 18, 31, 35 and 36 are allowable, dependent claims 19-30 and 32-34 are also allowable.

In view of the above amendments and remarks it is respectfully submitted that claims 18 – 36 are now in condition for allowance. Prompt Notice of Allowance is respectfully and earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Sol Sheinbein
Registration No. 25,457

Date: June 24, 2004